

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 2 and 10 have been amended to each include a feature of Claim 4, 6, or 12 and to clarify the irregularities. Support can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6, for example. Claims 4, 6, and 12 have been amended accordingly. Claims 14-16 have been added. Support can be found in Claims 4, 6, and 12, respectively. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Advisory Action

The Advisory Action states: "'no canvas formed on the helical teeth' would be obvious in view of the prior art disclosed." Further, the Advisory Action states: "The examiner feels that the disclosure of Kimura discloses core cords 2 which are located adjacent to the space between teeth such that the core cords would have an impact on the surface condition of elastomeric portion of the body, and that this feature would be further evidence in the omission of a canvas on the teeth as taught by Uehara et al." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 2 and 10 as amended herein recite, among other things, "said surface having irregularities created by the twisting of the core cords and configured to contact tops of pulley teeth, said irregularities being created a result of wrapping the core cords around and in contact with a cylindrical mold having female helical teeth and injecting the urethane resin into a cavity defined between the cylindrical mold and an outer cylinder mold enclosing the cylindrical mold." That is, *the twisting of the core cords is substantially exposed at the surface* so that the irregularities by the twisting contact tops of pulley teeth. No prior art references in any combination teaches this feature. In Kimura, the core cords may be located relatively close to a surface, but this is because the surface is covered by the canvas. It is common knowledge in the art that in a rubber belt, core cords are fully embedded in the rubber belt so that the core cords are not exposed and will not touch a pulley. It was believed that if the core cords are exposed, the core cords cause frictions and are apt to receive damage, resulting in fatal defects. In the prior art, the core cords are always protected by either a rubber material or a canvas as evidenced by Kimura and Onoe, for example.

Appl. No. : 10/595,804
Filed : June 12, 2006

In the claimed invention, the twisting of the core cords is positively used to resist thrust force. No prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

The patentability of the other features of the claims has been discussed in the Amendment and Response to Final Office Action of August 6, 2009, the entry and consideration of which is requested in the RCE filed concurrently herewith.

New Claims 14-16

Claims 14-16 recite the core cords are made of aramid fiber, which is not taught by the prior art. For this reason, these claims could not be obvious over the prior art, and also due to their dependencies from Claim 2 or 10, the patentability of which is discussed above.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The grounds for rejection which are not discussed herein are moot and Applicants expressly do not acquiesce in the findings not separately addressed. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Appl. No. : 10/595,804
Filed : June 12, 2006

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 18 Sept. 2009

By: Daniel Altman

Daniel E. Altman
Registration No. 34,115
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

7825001
091809